

UC-NRLF




B 3 228 501


LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
GIFT OF

Pres. Horace Davis.

Received Aug. , 1889.

Accessions No. 39244 Shelf No.





IF WE WOULD PERPETUATE THE REPUBLIC WE MUST DEFEND
AND PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF ITS LABORERS.

SPEECH

OF


HON. WILLIAM D. KELLEY,
OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1884.

WASHINGTON.
1884.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. KELLEY.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 5893) to reduce import duties and war-tariff taxes—

Mr. KELLEY said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In obedience to the suggestion of friends I am to follow the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, whose remarks, however, I do not propose to discuss in detail. The premises I shall assume and the general scope of my argument will, I think, be regarded as making a clear issue between us on the grave questions he has raised by proposing a bill providing for a general reduction of our custom duties.

I do not believe that a cheapening of goods, which involves a reduction of wages, can relieve any stagnant American industry. The evil from which we are suffering is not that goods are not cheap enough or that we can not produce them in sufficient abundance and of satisfactory quality. The truth is—and the sooner American lawmakers shall accept it as a controlling consideration the better it will be for the country—that the power of production the world over has, upon the prevailing basis of the distribution of the joint production of labor and capital, outrun the power of consumption; that all markets are overstocked; and that in every land multitudes of skilled and industrious people have, from many proximate but secondary causes, been idle for a large portion of many recent years.

Nihilism in Russia, socialism in Germany, socialism in the western and nihilism in the eastern sections of Austria, communism in France, socialism accepted by the state within the limits of the British Islands, in the promotion of which Gladstone and Beaconsfield were for years engaged in a heated race and which will present almost every question

the British Parliament will consider during the present session, are but expressions of the discontent born of indescribable suffering which the masses of the people of all transatlantic countries feel they can no longer endure. Enforced idleness, want, and misery are found in every industrial center; machinery stands idle part of every year; capital claims that it can only obtain its fair reward by further reducing the wages of labor, while the average supply of food of the laboring classes is in many parts of Europe inadequate to the development and support of the human system.

In a recent letter from Zurich, my daughter, Miss Florence Kelley, says:

Our countryman, Dr. —, informed us last evening that though for fifteen years he had been official physician to the poor in some of the worst wards of New York, he had never seen in America a case of pernicious anemia—which is the shrinking and decay of the bones of a human being as the result of insufficient food during childhood and youth—a disease which when it has once attacked the system can not be eradicated by any diet that may subsequently be taken; but that “unfamiliar as this disease is at home, it is so common here that the frequent cases exposed at the clinics attract no special attention.”

Are our Democratic associates in their mad pursuit of cheap goods willing to add pernicious anæmia to the list of diseases with which our working people are already familiar?

A GLANCE AT THE CONDITION OF BRITISH LABORERS.

Sir, last year I spent three months in England, “prosperous, merry, free-trade England.” After the first week my increasing strength permitted me to ride or walk a little each day, and I was tempted to visit the slums of London, which I did under proper police protection. I also read or had read to me each of the daily journals, and on Saturday for thirteen consecutive weeks the articles entitled “How the poor live,” which, written and illustrated by Mr. George R. Sims and Frederick Barnard, appeared in the Pictorial World.

Enlightened as I had thus been, it did not surprise me to learn that distinguished prelates of the established church had in a church congress warned those to whom they had a right to speak with authority that the condition of the poor of England, as they had found it upon personal inspection within a short distance from the palaces of the Queen and the Prince of Wales, was as bad as that of the French *sans culottes* in the years immediately preceding the sanguinary revolution of 1793. A dissenting clergyman, the eloquent and devoted pastor of Bloomsbury

chapel, which stands but a few hundred feet from Bloomsbury Square and the solid middle-class mansions around it, said to his congregation that he had found but a short distance from the pulpit from which he spoke a family of nine, including father, mother, sons and daughters, who occupied a cellar not larger than the space marked by six of the pews his hearers occupied. "This was not," he said, "a peculiar case, but one of many thousands."

Within a week we have read, at least those of us who watch the papers for such indications of the condition of the British people, of a family found by the coroner near Westminster's grand old abbey, and in one of the most aristocratic quarters of London, in a cellar without a window, one member of which—a girl of full age—had just died, but whose flesh had been largely consumed by vermin before death had come to her relief. These are said to be familiar chapters in the lives of tens of thousands who, though able and willing to work, can find no place among the wage-earners of free-trade England, the country our Democratic friends present as a national exemplar from whom they would have us accept as indisputable truths dogmas the prevalence of which in that country has produced these terrible results. Under their leadership we are thus to enter the race with the world for cheapness. They should remember that when Cobden and his co-workers began the agitation for free trade, Carlyle admonished them that they were entering into a race with barbarous nations for the production of the "cheap and nasty." It was he, too, who gave the political economy taught by Malthus and Ricardo the appellation of the "dismal science," because it suggested war, pestilence, and famine as beneficent agents appointed by an all-wise and loving Providence as the only instrumentalities whereby He could relieve the earth of an inevitable surplus of population. That dismal science still prevails in British schools, and consequently no animal that can be utilized is of so little value in England as an unemployed working man or woman with a reasonably good appetite for bean-cake or oat-meal porridge.

"Yes," I think I hear some of you rejoin, "you studied the poverty of London, which is, we are ready to admit, unparalleled." No; I spent ten days, unknown to everybody but my daughter, who was my companion, in Birmingham and in visiting the manufacturing towns around that rich and beautiful city. We visited so much of the over-

crowded precincts of the city itself as a lady might ride into, and in charge of a policeman I went beyond these limits. Our visits embraced Halesowen, Lye, Lye-Waste, and Cradley, where we found women making nails, trace-chains, heavy fire-bricks, and galvanizing hollow-ware.

I observe among those who do me the honor to be present my friend from Kentucky [Mr. TURNER], who comes to each succeeding Congress on the doctrine of free trace-chains, a bill to transfer which article to the free-list he never fails to introduce. The introduction of the bill does nobody any harm, and I shall continue to welcome him as long as I shall be returned and a Democrat comes from that district.

Mr. TURNER, of Kentucky. I never weary in well-doing, and I hope that after a while you will grant us that reasonable request.

Mr. KELLEY. Oh, yes; you ought to have free trace-chains, for we learned that the women who make them, if they are quick and good hands, can realize 25 cents a day. [Applause on the Republican side.] And all they have to pay for the privilege of earning it out of their weekly wage of 6s. is 1s. 6d. for the forge and fuel, and another 6d. for having the rods out of which to make the chains brought to the forge. Free trace-chains! God forbid that any Kentucky girl or woman should ever work at such unwomanly employment for such starvation wages, even though it be to furnish cheap trace-chains to my friend and his constituents. [Applause.]

I say to the gentleman as my friend Emory A. Storrs said to a party of Englishmen when at the dinner-table of a friend in London, they undertook to badger him on the subject of free trade. "Gentlemen, you do not want to provoke a discussion of that intricate subject at this social board. I will admit that free trade is best for you, at least for those of you who can afford to purchase anything; but I claim that protection is best for us. The vital difference between us is that you think more a great deal of a cheap shoe than you do of a prosperous shoemaker; while in America we think more of the welfare of the artisan than of the cheapness of his product." [Renewed applause.]

In one of the smallest and dingiest of the forges of Halesowen we found two men at work making light nails, such as girls are put to making when at 14 years of age the British law allows them to leave school and enter upon their lives of unwomanly toil. One of these men was a cripple and the other was evidently suffering from pul-

monary disease. One of them by expending his force for full time could earn 3s. per week and the other 4s., from each of which sums are deducted weekly 1s. for fuel and furnace rent, so that at the close of the week they had as a net result of their joint toil \$1.25. In the villages I have named, all of which are appendages of Birmingham, we also saw English girls and matrons making large fire-bricks; one carrying against her breast or stomach heavy lumps of wet clay, out of which her co-worker, it may be her sister or mother, molded the immense bricks which she who had brought the clay carried to a heated space near to where she was to pick up her next load of wet clay. Why, you ask, do these girls engage in such work? The answer is a simple one; they prefer to make bricks, because they can make 6s., or a dollar and a half, net per week, while their sisters who make nails or chains can not assuredly earn so much, and are, as I have said, subject to a charge of 1s. 6d. per week for fuel and rent of forge.

The chief specialties of Cradley are chains and hollow-ware. There we saw girls galvanizing stew-pans, boilers, bath-tubs, and other articles of like nature. The desperate struggle for life imposed on British toilers by cheap goods and low wages is well illustrated at Cradley. The assured receipt of \$1.50 a week will tempt women from the nail or chain maker's forge to the brick-shed. The pay of a galvanizer is \$1.75 per week; and for this additional shilling girls will pass the forge and the brick-shed to engage in a galvanizing room, although the strongest of them knows that in less than six months the gases generated by the process will vitally impair her health. In this connection I submit a brief extract from one of Miss Kelley's published letters.

It is characteristic of the neighborhood of Birmingham that each village has one industry; thus nailers and chainmakers are as thoroughly separated as though their work differed radically and separation were needed. But the difference between Lye-Waste and Cradley is slight. There are the same forges, the same hovels, the same dusty roads, and the same industrious people. To tell the story of the chainmakers, who we watched at their forges, is merely to repeat the picture of Stocking Lane, and this I have no wish to do. Here and there, however, the forges are interspersed with factories and "works," and the facts as to these works illustrate some of the ills to which the nailers eagerly fly in their effort to escape from their peculiar slavery.

In one establishment we were shown young women at work on galvanizing pails, and our guide (who had come over from Lye-Waste for our benefit) observed privately concerning them, "They'm flyin' from nailin', and they thinks it's a fine thing to get seven shillin's a week. But they gets poorly, and then they gets sick, and then their parents has to keep 'em, and they don't earn nothin' for a long time till they'm well again." This we were prepared to be-

lieve, for we found difficulty in breathing in the first room to which an intelligent foreman showed us. This was a large, dusky room, with a high ceiling, and arrangements for ventilation with which we could find no fault. But in the middle of the room stood a seething cauldron of a steaming fluid. Back of this stood a man dipping pails in the cauldron and handing them to young girls, who swiftly rolled each pail in a heap of sawdust, then deftly brushed the fluid over the metal surface, assuring an equal coating to every part. A few moments of breathing the fumes from the cauldron made our retreat to the sultry outdoor air very refreshing, and sufficed to convince us of the unwholesome nature of this work, even before we noticed long rows of carboys of vitriol which furnish one ingredient of the galvanizing fluid. "The inspection is severe," observed the foreman. "The works are closely watched, and if a girl works a half-hour overtime we're brought up roundly. It's very unwholesome work."

This brief extract will convince you that I do not speak of things of which I have merely read. No, gentlemen, I speak of incidents that I saw and of people with whom and whose employers I conversed. Sir, I do not want American goods to become so cheap that, as my distinguished friend the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MORRISON] said, we can sell to other people. God forbid that American labor shall ever be embodied in any production that shall be cheap enough to be sold at Halesowen, Lye, Lye-Waste, Cradley, and other manufacturing villages that surround Birmingham. [Applause.]

But depressing as was the influence of each of these towns in which the employments are in this country regarded as demanding masculine muscularity, girls and women are almost the only workers, our visit to Myrthyr Tydvil and to the great Dowlais iron-works upon the hill overlooking Myrthyr was still more saddening. In the neighborhood of Birmingham, Manchester, and Bradford the school law is admirably enforced, and during school hours children between 5 and 14 years of age are not frequently seen upon the highways. In this Welsh mining and iron district the contrast in this respect was as striking as it was painful. Here it is evident that the local authorities give but little if any attention to the enforcement of the only law which protects British childhood from the cruelest exactions of British industry. Here we found boys and girls loitering listlessly at all hours of the day in the reeking admixture of clay and grime which make the sidewalks and highways. It would have been a satisfaction to see them indulging in any of the plays of joyous childhood, but in our several tours we saw no instance of this.

The factory law, however, has even here had one good effect; it has reduced the number of women employed in the Dowlais works from

nearly 3,000 to about 1,000; and for this womankind throughout the civilized world may well be grateful. The Dowlais works are engaged in the production of heavy iron of all descriptions; the interior is a net-work of railroads, forges, furnaces, rolling-mills, and trip-hammers, the coarse labor in attendance upon all of which, as well as at the mouth of the coal-pit and on the cars, was until quite recently the special and almost exclusive work of girls and their mothers. The number of them, as I have said, has been reduced to about 1,000, and of these we saw some loading and unloading coal-cars; others, one upon the car pitching bricks to another upon the wet, rough floor, who piled them according to orders; others were handling and carrying heavy iron plates or bars from the lifting of which I would have shrunk in my days of greatest vigor.

Having asked the privilege of speaking to any of these women when not engaged, we felt free to interrogate them as to their wages. They might not have answered me, but to one of their own sex, who addressed them in tones of sympathy, they told their stories freely; and from all of them we learned that 6s. (\$1.50) was regarded as good wages for a week. I am unwilling to reduce the duties on any form of iron or steel 20 per cent., as is proposed by this bill, in order to allow my countrymen to consume the results of the labor of these British maidens, wives, and matrons. The plea that their employers, in order to sell us cheap goods, must compel them to accept such wages is not one that satisfies my judgment, but is one from which my manhood revolts.

At Manchester we remained nearly a fortnight. It is a noble city, the management of whose municipal affairs is unequalled in the United States. To Sheffield our visit was less protracted. The houses, grounds and conservatories of the great steel-makers who so long controlled our market, to some of which we were admitted, are regal in their extent and magnificence, but the offensive surroundings of the homes of the working people and the brutal coarseness we encountered at every turn in their quarter of the city made us glad to beat an early retreat.

The American traveler finds much to admire in the best parts of Birmingham, Manchester, Sheffield, Bradford, and every other great industrial center of England, but going thence to the localities in which working people dwell he will, unless he be a tariff reformer who believes that to get his supplies cheap is the chief end of man, be shocked by the

terrible contrast he beholds. In each city and town he will find long rows of small houses, between every two of which is an arched alley leading to a court, upon either side of which there are from four to six houses. These, like the front ones, are without cellars or underdrainage, have three small rooms rising one above another, each also having a house like unto itself built against its rear wall, the consequence of which is that thorough or through ventilation is impossible in any of these huddled groups of houses for workingmen and their families. The streets are the only play-ground for children, as well as drying ground for the wash of each family, whose patched and ragged garments flaunt in the breeze on lines drawn from house to house as if by common consent or express stipulation. For the use of the occupants of each court, together with those of the front buildings, there is one hydrant and one privy. In view of these hard conditions is it not too much to expect cleanliness, modesty of bearing, or chastity itself of families who are habitually huddled together in this fashion?

A house in any of the villages referred to, as small or smaller than these, of similar construction, with three rooms, the lower one a living-room, parlor, kitchen, and sitting-room, and chambers above, which furnish sleeping accommodations to the parents, the sons and daughters, and not infrequently to the husbands and wives of the sons and daughters and their children, all of whom are thus crowded into two little sleeping-rooms.

Yet it is of these sets of three apartments, contracted, dark, undrained, and unventilated, that those apostles of falsehood, Professor Sumner, of Yale, and Perry, of Williams College, speak when they compare their rental with that of the homes of American artisans to prove the superior condition of the working people of Great Britain to that of those of the United States.

It will hardly be regarded as possible that other classes of British laborers are housed with less consideration than the facts I have presented indicate, but the London Echo of Monday, October 8, 1883, says:

The paper read by Mr. George Smith, of Coalville, before the social science congress, on Saturday, gives a lamentable account of the condition of large numbers of canal children. Mr. Smith tells us that there are close upon 30,000 of these children of school age who never enter a school. Many of the cabins in which they live are so small that a man can neither stand upright nor lie out straight on the bed on which he and his wife and his children have to lie.

FREE SHIPS.

One of the most insidious pretences for the overthrow of our protective system is the demand for the admission of free ships and the material out of which ships may be built. Is there such a demand for ships to engage in international commerce as to justify us in abolishing the duties on pig, bar, angle, and heavy iron generally and on steel for the construction of Government and commercial vessels at the probable cost of dooming thousands of our workmen to idleness by opening our market to the free sale of British ships for which foreign capital and enterprise can find no employment? This is not a fancy sketch of the depressed condition of the British carrying trade or of the effect of such legislation upon our own coal, iron, and steel industries. This will appear to the most skeptical from the following telegram clipped from the Philadelphia Public Ledger of this morning:

DEPRESSION IN THE SHIPPING TRADE.

LONDON, April 12.—The depression in English shipping has become extreme. The ports are crowded with destitute and suffering sailors. In Shields alone there are 4,000 seamen out of employment. A hundred steamers are lying idle upon the Tyne. Ten thousand laborers in the Tyne ship-yards are out of work, and as many more in the Sunderland ship-yards. Business is slack in the yards along the Clyde, but so far there has been less suffering than in the other ship-building localities.

RAW MATERIALS.

Mr. Chairman, the persistency with which the unmeaning cry that raw material should be admitted free of duty has been maintained for years has nearly persuaded many good people that heavy duties are imposed on wide ranges of raw material which we can not produce for ourselves. Ignorant men may echo these cries as parrots chatter, but the free-trade Democracy, as represented on this floor, know better, and shout for free raw material for the purpose of deceiving the people. What article of raw material which they would make free can they name that is not and has not for years been on the free-list? The author of the original Morrison bill could find none. The free-list was to be a cardinal feature of his bill; the 20 per cent. reduction was to be less important because a less philosophic and a somewhat hap-hazard application of the doctrines of British political economy. To illustrate these doctrines scientifically an extended free-list was necessary. All this the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means understood per-

fectly, and that list as it appeared in the original bill embraced some twenty-five or thirty articles, among which, my friend will pardon me for saying, there was not one single specimen of unwrought material. Material that has been wrought is not raw. No one will say that broadcloth is raw material because a tailor may shape a coat therefrom. And so long as the designation raw material may properly be withheld from broadcloth so long it must be admitted that the authors of this bill were unable to find a single specimen of imported raw material that we can not produce that had not already been relieved of import duties. The fraudulent character of the claim that the great majority of the articles embraced in the free-list of the original bill were of the nature of raw material was so apparent, that the majority of the committee, at the instance I think of the author of the bill, withdrew all but three of them, namely, coal, lumber, and salt, every one of which is a prepared or manufactured commodity.

Is not coal raw, asks some misguided disciple of Sumner and Perry? Yes! When still in the earth and is bought and sold, as children say, unsight, unseen, coal is raw; but when thousands and oftentimes hundreds of thousands of dollars have been expended in obtaining access to it and preparing it for the purposes of manufactures and commerce; when shafts have been opened and breakers and railroads have been constructed and provided with adequate motive power and rolling-stock, and when hundreds or thousands of people have been employed in mining, manipulating, and sorting it so that while the coal shall be sent to market the slate and other impurities with which nature had intermixed it shall be left behind, it is absurd to speak of it as raw or unwrought material.

Is lumber, as described in the free-list of this bill, a raw material? No, sir! Timber in the forest is raw; but rough timber and quite a number of kinds of hewn timber are already on the free-list. Every article of wood embraced by the free-list of this bill as finally revised is material largely advanced by the expenditure upon it of money and labor. The remaining article in this wonderfully scientific free-list is salt.

Sir, instead of salt being a raw material it is a highly manufactured finished product, the raw material for the manufacture of which is brine as it wells up or is pumped from its hidden sources in the earth. The

expenditure of time, fuel, and labor converts the raw material furnished by nature into the commercial article known as salt, and which is needed by mankind for so many vital purposes. Now, sir, why may not a deduction of 20 per cent. from existing duties on these highly manufactured articles, coal, lumber, and salt, do as well in the way of tariff reform as a like reduction on the duties imposed on all the manufactured articles embraced by this bill? Will some advocate of this free-list tell me the process by which he reaches the conclusion that coal delivered to the steamer at the seaboard or at the forge or factory in the remote interior of the country is a raw material? how it is that boards sawed, planed, tongued and grooved, and other forms of wood prepared for carpentering and cabinet-making are ascertained to be raw materials? and by what magical power it is that nature, without the aid of man's labor or the expenditure of his time and money, converts *brine* into pure, dry salt and packs it into "bags, sacks, barrels, and other packages?" It must be remembered that this Morrison bill does not propose to put brine on the free-list. Oh, no; it provides for free salt, whether in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, and as it also makes these coverings free, it ought to tell us on what kind of trees or vines nature hangs the ready-made bags, sacks, and barrels as raw material.

Sir, I deny that the free-trade wing of the Democratic party on this floor is in favor of free native raw material or will admit many forms and grades of it to use till they have paid inordinate taxes. The two materials which enter into more of our mechanical and scientific productions than any other are brimstone and alcohol. We import much of our brimstone and it has long been on the free-list; but alcohol is an American production but one degree removed from a raw material in the production, current price of and an extended market for which our farmers have a vital interest. I speak of corn; yet, sir, with a single exception, these gentlemen who clamor so lustily for free raw material and cheap raw material have within a week proposed, voted for, and carried a resolution in favor of maintaining and requiring the payment of a tax of 90 cents on the manufactured product of every peck of corn before it can go into the market and be sold for use in the arts. Of the free-trade raw-material Democracy on this floor every man, with the single exception of my friend from New York [Mr. HEWITT] (who does me the honor to listen to me, and who after three years of contro-

versy between us as to the possibility of using methylated spirits frankly announced to the House the other day that he was in favor of free alcohol because it was a raw material which entered into so large a number of our manufactures), is opposed to the untaxed manufacture of those important forms of raw material, corn, rye, fruit, barley, hops, and tobacco. They demand the privilege of importing free of duty an infinite variety of foreign manufactured goods under the pretense that they are raw, but insist upon taxing all forms of material our farmers can produce, including nature's great and only pure solvent, the rival of brimstone in the universality of its use in the arts, at the rate of 90 cents a peck upon corn, the raw material from which it is extracted by a single process of manufacture. My free-trade friends, if you are in favor of free raw material for manufactures, and wish to secure ample markets and good prices for the crops of our farmers, why do you insist upon the prepayment of a tax of \$3.60 upon a bushel of corn before you permit its first manufactured yield to go into the arts in the United States? Out upon such hollow and shallow pretenses of devotion to American interests and national industries! I should remark that it is the free-trade wing of the Democracy I thus denounce, for my Democratic colleagues from Pennsylvania are all in favor of removing these infamous impositions upon our home production and commerce.

Before leaving this question finally I should say that the tax we impose on his corn is but part of the wrong we do the farmer. It is a tax of more than 400 per cent., and to this extent increases the cost of every alcoholic preparation, whether of drug or perfumery, whether collodion for the production of a photograph or chloroform for benumbing the senses during the operation of the dentist or surgeon, whether the preparation by his wife of her winter's supply of liquid camphor and arnica, or whether it has gone into any of the thousand articles which he purchases for daily use without suspicion that in their cost he is paying the "whisky tax." This tax is higher than any duty known to the tariff. It increases the cost of almost every manufactured article the farmer purchases, and he should know that they who insist upon its maintenance are more devoted to the theories of foreign economists than they are to the practical economies of their laboring countrymen.

THE TOBACCO TAX.

What is the effect of the tobacco tax upon the interests of the farmer

and the wage-earning classes generally of the country? The Speaker of the House submitted a proposition to the recent Democratic caucus for the repeal of the tobacco tax and reduction of the tax that prevents the small farmers of the South from using the raw material they grow upon their peach and apple trees. He, however, coupled with these offers a proviso that such legislation would only be granted in consideration of the reduction of the duties imposed by the present tariff. With this boon to farmers he would bribe their Representatives to unite with him in prostrating the manufacturers of the country and their workmen. It is creditable to their discretion that no gentleman who figured at that caucus has yet exhibited the courage to present such a bill to Congress and the people. This resolution by its terms and in the source whence it emanated is so remarkable that the country may be incredulous as to my statement; I had therefore better present its text as I found it in the Democratic organ the morning following the caucus:

Mr. CARLISLE then offered the following resolution, which was adopted—88 to 27:

*“Resolved, That in order to reconcile conflicting opinions and secure legislation reducing taxation the plan for the reduction of taxes at the present session of Congress should embrace a provision repealing all internal-revenue taxes on tobacco, snuff, and cigars, and special taxes connected therewith, and also reducing the tax on brandy distilled from fruit to 10 cents per gallon: *Provided*, Such repeal and reduction shall not be made except in connection with the reduction of tariff duties.”*

Let us look at the effect of this tobacco tax upon the earnings and possible savings of our laborers, the repeal of which can be purchased only at such fearful cost. During the last fiscal year it yielded something over \$46,000,000, and the bill of March 3 last would, it was hoped, reduce the receipts from this source nearly 50 per cent. The receipts from tobacco, snuff, and cigars will therefore amount this year to about \$25,000,000, every cent of which is wantonly abstracted from the producing classes of America. No foreigner has hitherto paid or is now required to pay the tobacco tax. When it is manufactured tobacco goes into a bonded warehouse, and when it is to be exported it is delivered to the carrier, released from bond, and free from tax.

Chewing is not the habit of our wealthy and more refined citizens. We rarely find a cuspidor exposed in any part of an elegant mansion, but we do find in many instances daintily wrought ash-cups and the

conveniences for smoking in richly appointed libraries. The consequence is that our rich men contribute no part of the millions which we derive from the internal tax on tobacco. If they smoke or offer to their friends an American cigar it is because they have been cheated in a purchase. They pay for and desire to use imported cigars. If, therefore, they put any taxed tobacco between their lips it is because they have been cheated.

To learn who contribute the \$26,000,000 to the surplus treasure of the Government this year you must go into the mines, the furnaces, the forges, and the workshops of the country, or watch the groups on a fair and pleasant evening that gather about the homes of our working people in town and city. Here you will see at the homestead door parents and children, and the weary father while enjoying these hours of quiet home life is in almost every case seen to be smoking his pipe or giving other evidence that he finds comfort in indulgence in the tobacco habit. So with the sailor; as he walks his lonely watch under the stars or in the beating of the storm he finds a companion whose influence is soothing in a quid of tobacco, regardless of the fact that his Government is making him pay a tax of from four to eight hundred per cent. upon its true market value.

You may reply to these economic truths by saying that tobacco is not a good thing for laboring people to use; that it is useless if it is not positively injurious to them, and should therefore be taxed. If you rest your statutory infringement of the rights of the American growers and consumers of tobacco upon this doctrine, will you not do me and those of your countrymen who are burdened by these unnecessary taxes the favor to read the clause in the Constitution which justifies you in mulcting with pecuniary penalties those who find comfort in its use, as do the miner, the sailor, and the millions of those employed in every department of labor within the broad limits of our country from whom this tax will this year abstract \$26,000,000?

Before these taxes were imposed the workingman in any Northern city or town could for 1 cent buy four cigars made of better tobacco than he now buys for use in his pipe; but the tax on each cigar is now more than the price was or would be again for the grade of cigars of which I speak if the tax was repealed. To remove the tax on tobacco would be to remit to the industrial classes of this country from twenty

to twenty-five millions of dollars a year, and the responsibility for not doing it, as well as for maintaining the tax on alcohol, which goes into the arts, rests with that party which has a majority of seventy in this House.

TAUGHT BY EXPERIENCE.

The producing classes of England are at last realizing how great a burden upon them is the excise or internal-tax system. Many of them are confused by the fact that the government ingeniously speaks of an internal tax as an excise duty, and as yet fail to see the vital contrast in the effect of a burdensome tax and a protective duty; but experience is very rapidly enlightening them on this point. Here is a curious illustration of the fact I assert, the report of which I clipped from the London Standard of April 4, 1883, on which day it appeared as current news in all the leading journals. Gentlemen will observe that the chancellor of the exchequer, in closing his interview with a deputation, said:

There was no doubt, having himself gone over Tiffany's and the other large shops in New York, that the development of the silver trade in the States was due to their fiscal policy.

This admission by the British chancellor of the exchequer is a severe reflection upon the course now being pursued by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and his followers in striving to reverse the fiscal policy to which our manufacturing supremacy is due. But here is the article itself:

A deputation of the representatives of the silver trade in London waited yesterday on the chancellor of the exchequer in respect to the silver duties. The deputation was introduced by Sir George Campbell, M. P. Mr. E. J. Watherston and Mr. Johnson laid the views of the deputation before the chancellor of the exchequer, strongly urging the abolition of the duties on silver, as tending to cripple the trade far in excess of any value to the revenue likely to accrue. Another member of the deputation urged upon Mr. Childers the desirability, if the revenue did not permit of the reduction, to replace the silver duties by a 10 per cent. duty on imported watches and clocks, which would exactly make up the deficiency and at the same time benefit the interests of workingmen.

Mr. Childers in reply said it was scarcely the time to come before Parliament to ask for the remission of so important a sum, exceeding £100,000. In reference to the plea that the present duty of 1s. 6d. per ounce restricted trade it was a fact that of late silver had fallen in price 1s. per ounce, and yet the sales had decreased. With regard to the proposal to place a duty on watches and clocks he asked if that was not protection, and did the member of the deputation seriously ask him to adopt that policy?

The MEMBER. We would if we thought there was any chance of getting you to do so.

Mr. Childers said there was no doubt, having himself gone over Tiffany's and the other large shops in New York, that the development of the silver trade in the States was due to their fiscal policy. But he questioned the feasibility of giving effect to the proposals, though he promised to give the subject his thorough consideration.

The admission of the superiority of our financial system from such a source is a noteworthy fact, but the demand by so influential a deputation for the repeal of internal taxes and the substitution therefor of protective duties is a fact of such common occurrence as to deprive the body of the article of a title to special notice.

Mr. Chairman, the working people and the tax-payers of England are no longer exulting over the prosperity they derive from free trade. They are convinced that a financial system which burdens its labor, capital, and enterprise with internal taxes while subjecting them to free competition with the productions of the most inadequately paid labor of the world is false and destructive. Here [holding up a package of pamphlets] are a few protectionist pamphlets. They are from British workingmen, manufacturers, ship-owners, members of Parliament, barons, earls, and dukes. The Earl of Dunraven is a leading man in the movement, and from one of his latest speeches, which came to me but last evening in the Iron Age of the 10th instant, I propose to show you some of the effects of low duties and internal taxes upon what was the foremost nation of the world when little more than forty years ago she insensibly embraced the dismal science and engaged in the race for the cheap and nasty.

I find the speech in the report of a fair-trade demonstration at Birmingham. The proceedings were published largely in the press not only of Birmingham, Manchester, Sheffield, and other manufacturing towns, but of London. The Earl of Dunraven is president of the Fair-Trade Association of Great Britain. In the course of his remarks at the Birmingham demonstration he said:

It was claimed that England has benefited greatly by free trade. The great strides she made after the abolition of the corn laws are all attributed to the change in our fiscal system. That was partially but by no means altogether true. There were a great many other causes at work besides free trade. Free trade was of great benefit to us at one time, for the simple reason that we had the monopoly of the world's markets.

The people of the United States have not a monopoly of the world's markets, and therefore free trade can not be of the same benefit to them that it originally was to those who had that monopoly.

Other nations had no means of supplying themselves with goods. They had to buy from us, and consequently as our market was assured, as there was no difficulty in selling, it was an immense benefit to us to be able to buy everything as cheaply as possible. But since then things have altered very materially. Foreign nations have not only learned to supply themselves, but they are beginning to supply others. Although it is true that England made great strides under free trade, it is equally true that other nations have made as great, or even greater, strides under protection. The United States had increased £165,000,000 in accumulated wealth, France £75,000,000, and Great Britain £65,000,000. In percentage of trade increases Great Britain was only 21 per cent., while the United States was 67 per cent. In fact England was the last of the nations, instead of the first, as she ought to be.

Gentlemen will please notice that this statement is no "wandering Yankee's lie," but the statement of the Earl of Dunraven when surrounded by manufacturers and other influential personages from every part of England. Let me just here invite attention to a vital fact. In the race for cheapness manufacturers leave well fed countries and find their way to those in which labor is most depressed, and whose people, therefore, work for the smallest modicum of food and clothing; we find confirmation of this fact in a speech made by Mr. Robert P. Porter, late secretary of our Tariff Commission, at a fair-trade congress at Leamington, England, November 10, 1883. It may be well for me to say in passing that by the cry of fair trade is meant the repeal of internal taxes and the imposition of such duties on imports as will give British labor at least an equal chance with that of foreigners in British markets. It is a protest against free trade as advocated by our Democracy. In the course of his admirable address Mr. Porter said:

In France and Germany the industrial progress during the last ten years has been more marked than in Great Britain. The most dangerous of England's continental competitors in the textile industries may be found at Lille, Roubaix, Tourcoing, Rouen, and St. Etienne, in France; and Crefeld, Aachen, and Chemnitz, in Germany. The Rhenish and Westphalian coal and iron districts, with such works as those of Essen and Dortmund, and those at Seraing, Belgium, can produce iron and steel as cheaply as England can, and the certainty of a home market gives these protective countries the advantage in the contest for foreign trade. In view of this you will not be surprised when I tell you that I have found shoddy manufactures from Batley and Dewsbury established in Aachen, Prussia; Lancashire and Scottish spinners in Rouen; Leicestershire hosiery manufacturers in Saxony; Yorkshire wool-combing establishments in Rheims; Dundee jute mills in Dunkirk; all-wool-stuff manufacturers in the vicinity of Roubaix; English iron and steel mills in Belgium, and English woolen mills in Holland. I conversed with some of the gentlemen owning or superintending these mills, and was told that they could manufacture cheaper in these protective countries than in free-trade England. Removing their capital to the continent has secured a profitable home market, while England was near with widely open ports to serve as a "dumping ground" to unload surplus goods made by

foreign labor superintended by English skill. In this way the English markets are swamped and the laborer undersold.

CONTRACTING OUR INDUSTRIES.

Mr. Chairman, by the reduction of duties that were not excessive and the total repeal of others we have begun the dangerous work of expelling manufactures hitherto well established in our midst. When the Forty-seventh Congress assembled it was my hope and that of my protectionist associates, and I think it was also the hope of the really conservative men of the country, that while there might be reduction of duties in some instances, there were others in which by departmental or judicial decision or Congressional action duties under which industries had grown up had been fatally reduced, which might now be restored. In this hope we were disappointed; a vigilant minority proved in many instances capable of not only preventing restoration of just duties, but in alliance with a few Republican malcontents were able to reduce others below the protective standard. This action, together with that of the Forty-sixth Congress, in putting quinine on the free-list effected the banishment of several branches of industry which are of national importance, if not essential to national independence.

For many years we manufactured the best and purest quinine and cinchonidia that were produced anywhere; their character and quality were unquestioned. But two establishments in the world assumed to compete with us in these respects—the Howards of England and Pelle-tier of France. The tax of 90 cents a peck on corn when manufactured imposed a duty of \$1.80 per gallon on alcohol, the solvent vital to the manufacture of these drugs, but it could be paid because a protective duty countervailed this otherwise destructive tax; but by a united Democratic vote, aided by a few misguided but professed protectionists, quinine, cinchonidia and all other salts of quinia have been put upon the free-list. The gentlemen on that side of the House who engineered and accomplished this work tell the country that they are for a revenue tariff; they even tell us in the face of what we have seen them do in this very matter that they are for a revenue tariff.

Let us test their sincerity by this action of theirs. To in part countervail the tax on alcohol, cinchona bark had been put on the free-list, and when quinine and cinchonidia were also put there, what revenue from these drugs had these revenue-tariff men left the Government?

To this extent, at least, their demand for a revenue tariff is like their protestations in favor of free raw material—hollow and insincere.

What has been the result of this absurd legislation? Why, Mr. Weightman, the surviving member of the firm of Powers & Weightman, determining not to be driven from a business to which he had devoted the best years of his life, sent a competent agent to Europe to establish a manufactory of quinine and cinchonidia where wages were low. Within six weeks he has purchased the largest establishment of the kind in Germany, and having shipped his stock of raw and partially manufactured materials and his retorts and other implements, has also sent that brilliant chemist and scientist Dr. John Weightman to superintend the manufacture by German laborers of quinine, cinchonidia, and other salts for his old customers and those of his old home competitors. With German wages and free alcohol he can undersell all American competitors, and thus monopolize the American market, as well as secure a good share if not all the money the Government used to receive from the duty on quinine and other salts of quinia. By thus banishing one house we have closed all the others and made the United States the dumping-ground for the cheap and adulterated quinine of all irresponsible continental manufacturers.

The argument with Mr. Weightman is that if the United States prohibit him by law from following his business here he will pursue it elsewhere, and if he thus makes apparent to his countrymen the inevitable results of such absurd legislation, he may do some good to the future industries of the country he loves and which is so gifted with raw material. Thus did anti-protective legislation banish one vital industry and deprive a few hundred American laborers of employment. But we have recently perpetrated graver follies of the same kind.

The Republican party had put a duty of $2\frac{2}{10}$ cents per pound on tin plates, under which duty the manufacture of such plates was successfully established at more than one point, when the Treasury Department succeeded by some means in permitting itself to be persuaded that a comma, which if removed to another clause would reduce the duty to 1 1-10 cents per pound, was out of place. It thereupon, instead of referring the question to Congress who had put the comma there, ordered the suggested change to be made and thus ruined the proprietors

of the young establishments who were just organizing a prosperous business and perpetuated our dependence on Great Britain for the \$20,000,000 worth of tin plates we consume per annum. So, too, a decision of the Treasury first, and Congressional action subsequently confirming it, reduced the duty on cotton-ties and hoop-iron cut to lengths, and left the American market at the mercy of foreign manufacturers, because no establishment in the country could pay American wages for the manufacture of these articles in competition with the starvation wages of England.

In the last revision of the tariff there was a special provision that where two or more rates of duties were made applicable to the same article the highest rate should be applied by the Treasury. This was the case as to iron and steel wire rods, to which in construing different parts of the bill it was found three rates were applicable. To solve this difficulty the Department practically ruled that Congress meant lowest when it said highest, and declared the lowest duty, six-tenths of 1 per cent., to be that which must be collected. Thus was banished from the country the manufacture of iron and steel wire rods; and I am informed by my friend from New York [Mr. HEWITT], whose authority on this point no Democrat will dispute, that he and all other American manufacturers of wire rods, which was a large and very important branch of the iron trade, are now unable to manufacture rods in competition with the low prices prevailing in Europe, and have had to abandon the manufacture of rods and import their entire supply.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Let me interrupt the gentleman to say that it was your tariff that did it, and not a Democratic tariff.

Mr. KELLEY. I am not discussing the question whether the tariff enacted last session was adopted by Republicans or Democrats, but can truly say that if 20 per cent. of the Democrats in each House had united with the Republicans we would have put through a tariff which would have prevented the destruction of the gentleman's business and allowed his firm to continue to make its wire-rods in this country and by the aid of American workmen.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Would you have allowed me to fix things on the conference committee?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes, sir. But no Democrat would accept a place

on that committee save Mr. CARLISLE, who, by consent of his partisan friends, did so that he might report what was done by the committee. Senator after Senator declined to serve, and we waited nearly a day just at the close of the session in the hope of getting Democrats to come in and aid in perfecting the complex details of the bill.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Then the whole performance was a Republican performance, according to the gentleman's own statement, and they are wholly responsible for the result.

Mr. KELLEY. No. Democrats like you shirked it; and the Republicans who sat on the conference committee had to deal with the material sent it. The effort was to defeat the bill by delay, and thus Democratic tactics made it necessary to deal summarily with many parts of the bill.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Allow me to state that Democrats like myself were not here.

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman palters with the question, and will, if permitted, consume my time as that of the committee of conference was so nearly consumed by Democratic delays. I must therefore proceed by asking the gentleman from New York or any of his Democratic associates to tell me whether it is the Republicans of the House who are here and now proposing to further reduce the duty on wire rods 20 per cent.? Who voted to consider the proposition to-day, the Democrats or the Republicans? The gentleman talks about and endeavors to confuse what occurred a year ago; but I propose to go back but two hours, so that the day's Journal can tell the most oblivious of us what he has just done. [Laughter.] There will be no question of veracity between us on a journalized fact not two hours old.

A MANUFACTURING NATION WITHOUT WORKSHOPS.

Having shown that the British ship-building interest is much depressed, and that British sailors and ship-owners are suffering greatly by the depression of the carrying trade, let me now proceed to furnish proof of the proposition that if the nations of the world are to compete simply for cheapness of production, and if cheap commodities for consumers is the chief end of man and the highest object of government, general production must be transferred to those countries in which the laboring classes can keep soul and body together on the least amount

and cheapest character of food. It was in support of this theory that I invited your attention to the fact that British capitalists whose lives have been devoted to the production of leading British fabrics and wares have carried their capital and skill to foreign countries in which, by the aid of lower wages, they can manufacture more cheaply, and after supplying the country to which they have gone, can dump their surplus goods free of duty into merry, old, free-trade England, the predominant characteristic of which is coming to be the prevalence of idleness, poverty, and starvation.

The rapidity with which the burden of excise duties or internal taxes, the weight of which is not offset by countervailing protective duties, is verifying the prediction made by Sir Edward Sullivan about fifteen years ago, that under this policy England would soon become a manufacturing nation without workshops, would long since have awakened to a sense of danger a people who were less enslaved by fetich worship than are the political economists of Great Britain. Here is the Manchester Examiner of March 27 telling us of the closing and destruction of Messrs. Jackson's textile mills at Blackburn. It is not so suggested, but it is nevertheless quite within the range of possibilities that the Messrs. Jackson will transfer their mill to India, where wages are lower and production cheaper than in any country of Europe.

In consequence of bad trade and their inability to effect an insurance on the older portion of their mills in George street west and neighborhood, Blackburn, the firm of Messrs. R. R. Jackson & Co. have given orders for the whole concern to be closed, and both in the spinning and weaving departments the hands are working up the material on hand. It is expected that they will all have finished within three weeks. The old mill and the new mill, containing 71,000 spindles, are to be razed to the ground, and the material sold. Phoenix Mill, which has been only recently rebuilt after a fire, is to have its looms taken out and sold, and then sold as a spinning mill, containing 18,000 spindles. In the two first-named mills the whole machinery is new and on the throstle principle. The three weaving sheds, containing respectively 733, 365, and 185 looms, are to be let, either separately or together, as going concerns if possible. Messrs. Jackson pay over £1,000 weekly in wages, having in their various mills, which form one great block, 89,000 spindles and 1,500 looms. The whole of the buildings to the west of the watch-house are to be pulled down, and these are the most extensive portions of the premises.

INDIA'S WRONGS AND BRITAIN'S PUNISHMENT.

Mr. Chairman, the story of the recent industrial progress of India is in my judgment more instructive so far as economic questions are concerned

than that of any other people. No measure that promised to prevent the diversification and restrict the quantity of Indian manufactures to which their powers might be extended has been omitted by either the British or the Anglo-Indian Government. For many years the Indian tariff imposed a duty of from 3 to 5 per cent. on cotton goods imported into that country and admitted raw cotton duty free. To these provisions Lancashire uttered no objection so long as she enjoyed a practical monopoly of the Indian market. But 10 cents a day is liberal pay for an Indian weaver or spinner, and in the race for cheapness India was beating Lancashire; this if it could prevent it the British Government must not permit. The viceroy, doubtless under instructions from the home government, submitted to his council a proposition for the repeal of the duty on imported cotton goods. The council, pointing to the revenue the duty yielded, £1,000,000 annually, reminded the viceroy that this large sum had failed to prevent a deficiency in the budget, and voted against the proposition. The council was powerless, and the viceroy by an arbitrary edict abolished the duty.

This, however, was not enough to satisfy rapacious Lancashire. Low wages compensated for the loss of duty, and the number of Indian mills continued to increase. This sign of prosperity among pagan subjects the Christian Government of Great Britain could not tolerate so long as there was a hope of its defeat. How could that be accomplished? Lancashire was quick to suggest means. The short-staple cotton of India can not be worked successfully without an admixture of long-staple foreign cotton, which had always been admitted free of duty, but this should now be subjected to a tax; and, against the protest of every chamber of commerce in India, in 1875 a tax of 5 per cent. was imposed on all raw cotton which should thereafter be imported into the country. No violation of the principles of British political economy could be more flagrant than this.

The Calcutta Englishman of August 5, 1875, said:

If the details given in the telegram which we publish this morning are correct the new tariff bill is about as infamous a measure as ever a subservient legislature sought to impose upon a voiceless people. An import duty on raw material is under any circumstances one of the worst modes of raising the revenue that can be devised. But the duty which the Government is about to impose on a particular quality of raw cotton imported into this country is nicely calculated to produce the greatest amount of injury that could possibly be inflicted by such

an impost. The present viceroy is too acute an economist not to know what the effect of such a measure must be, and it is impossible to resist the conviction that it is for the sake of the injury it will inflict on India that the measure is proposed.

He who wishes to read the details of this infamous procedure will find it condensed into a few pages of David Syme's *Industrial Science*.

But—terrible experience for Lancashire!—the result of this inhuman action of the British Government of India has proven that Indian laborers, whose food is exclusively rice, can live for less than 10 cents a day. Let me reserve the district of Orissa from this statement. It is an agricultural district, from the rivers of which the people take fish sufficient for winter food. Upon the salt to preserve the fish there is imposed a direct tax of 500 per cent. Ten cents a day will not always support a laborer in Orissa; for within the memory of my friend the 500 per cent. tax on salt has twice doomed the people of the district to permit their whole catch of fish to rot and the province of Orissa to the loss of a million of its people by famine.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CHACE. I move that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania being extended? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KELLEY. With thanks to the committee, I proceed to bring to its attention a body of facts which, while they confirm the theory I am supporting, also prove that a just God is enabling the poor, persecuted, hunted, and starved millions of British Indians to punish their oppressors by crowding English productions out, not only of the Indian market but out of Oriental markets generally, by means of the cheapness at which their oppressors have compelled them to work.

Prominent among the manufacturers and warehousemen of Manchester is Mr. Robert Barclay. He is a frequent contributor to the press when economic questions are under consideration. His latest pamphlet, entitled "Foreign competition and the silver question," furnishes the following impressive facts:

There is little direct data obtainable showing the displacement of British manufactures in India itself by the Bombay mills. The Calcutta import-list, however, giving imports from other Indian ports, shows an increase in yarns (presumably from Bombay) of from 8,814 bales in 1879 to 15,899 bales in 1882. Other

articles, such as T cloths, under this head also show a rapid increase; but re exports may be included, and I do not give the figures. As negative evidence, however, the stationary, or rather the declining, figures of the imports from England, as shown in the Indian statistics, which give more full details than our own board of trade returns, are very suggestive. They are as follows for the last three years:

	April 1 to March 31—		
	1880-'81.	1881-'82.	1882-'83.
	<i>Yards.</i>	<i>Yards.</i>	<i>Yards.</i>
Manufactured gray piece-goods imported into India from the United Kingdom.....	1,160,745,903	1,093,756,075	1,079,849,622
Manufactured bleached piece-goods imported into India from the United Kingdom.....	282,764,355	267,473,795	231,939,081
Manufactured colored, printed, or dyed goods imported into India from the United Kingdom.....	315,373,965	251,612,193	318,369,975
Total.....	1,758,884,223	1,612,872,063	1,630,158,678

As regards the increase of exports from India the following figures speak for themselves:

Exports of yarns to China, Japan, &c.

Year.	Quantity.	Value.
	<i>Pounds.</i>	
1876-'77.....	7,926,710	£367,303
1877-'78.....	15,600,201	682,059
1878-'79.....	21,333,508	886,431
1879-'80.....	25,862,474	1,109,234
1880-'81.....	26,901,346	1,232,576
1881-'82.....	30,786,304	1,368,836
1882-'83.....	45,223,000	2,014,100
1883—one-half year, April 1 to August 31.....	22,282,567	866,250

Exports of piece-goods to China, Japan, &c.

Year.	Yards.	Value.
1876-'77.....	15,544,168	£373,657
1877-'78.....	17,545,464	372,304
1878-'79.....	22,661,231	420,150
1879-'80.....	25,800,501	444,309
1880-'81.....	30,424,032	540,711
1881-'82.....	29,911,017	556,409
1882-'83.....	41,563,000	759,800
1883—one-half year, April 1 to August 31.....	24,880,355	374,092

The following particulars, also taken from a Chinese newspaper in March last, show the Bombay yarns were cutting out English yarns at the port of Hong-Kong, Bombay yarns having increased from 3,000 bales in 1875 to 75,000 bales in 1882, while English yarns had decreased during the same period from 16,000 bales to 11,000 bales.

Table showing number of bales of 16s to 24s shipped to Hong-Kong.

	1875.	1877.	1878.	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.
Bombay yarns	3,000	16,000	24,000	40,000	39,000	55,000	75,000
English yarns.....	16,000	12,000	13,000	12,000	19,000	15,000	11,000

Mr. Barclay in this instance confined his investigations to the cotton textile trade, with which his interests are so largely identified, and his facts are certainly very suggestive. They are, however, more than confirmed by the Economist, the highest financial and economic authority in England. In the issue of that paper of the 29th of last September, under the title of "Some features of the Indian trade," is an elaborate notice of the annual review of the foreign trade by Mr. J. E. O'Connor, the assistant secretary to the department of finance and commerce, from which review I make the following brief extracts:

The bulk of the Indian trade is with this country, but of late years we have not been securing so large a proportion of the business as we formerly did. In the five years ending March, 1877, the proportion of the trade with the United Kingdom to the whole trade of India averaged 60.72 per cent.; for the following five years the average was 56.53 per cent., while last year it was 55.31 per cent.

* * * * *

Although, however, this is still the day of small things so far as Indian manufactures are concerned, these are making considerable progress. Here is the record of the growth of the cotton weaving and spinning during the past four years.

	Yearending March—	
	1883.	1878.
Number of mills.....	62	53
Number of looms.....	14,882	10,533
Number of spindles.....	1,583,782	1,289,760
Number of persons employed.....	52,763	Not stated.

Now, moreover, a new cotton-mill is about to be established at Bangalore another at Bodnera, in Berar, and eight more at Bombay, and it is therefore, Mr. O'Connor thinks, to be expected that at the end of this year there will be at least seventy-two mills at work in India, with about 19,000 looms and little less than one and three-quarter million spindles, and employing about 58,000 operatives. Now, also, the mills in the north of India are competing with us in the supply of woollen goods of the coarser qualities. In the manufacture of jute goods also an increasing business is being done, the number of gunny bags exported last year being 60,738,000, as compared with 42,073,000 in the previous year, there being also a very large increase in the exports of gunny cloths. So prosperous, indeed, is this branch of manufacture that several mills are being extended and new ones erected, and it is expected that 1,500 additional looms will be in oper-

ation next year. Then the bootmaking industry, Mr. O'Connor reports, has taken a large development; though as yet it does not interfere with the import trade, as it is confined to a cheaper class of goods. Of beer, the Indian breweries produced last year 2,514,000 gallons, of which the Government took 1,700,000 gallons for the supply of the army, and now the Indian is supplanting to a considerable extent the English beer. And as to other industries, Mr. O'Connor writes that "the output of coal is increasing, and new fields of great capacity and good quality are being opened out; that the manufacture of iron is being carried on, and there is some prospect of its being taken up and carried out on a large scale, with that of steel, by English capitalists; that the manufacture of paper has taken a new and good departure; while that of leather has largely developed, and that in various other directions India is beginning to supply her own wants."

THE WORLD'S WHEAT MARKET.

These papers refer only to the interference of India's cheaper goods with the manufacturers of England; but here is matter of interest to American wheat-growers. It is a paragraph from the *Railway News*, which was copied into the *Manchester Examiner* and *Times* for March 27, 1884:

Referring to the great development of wheat exports from India since 1879, the *Railway News* says in 1879 the wheat exported from India was 1,044,000 hundredweights, of the value of £514,000, while in 1882 the exports increased to 19,863,000 hundredweights, and their value to £8,604,030. In the current year this quantity will probably be largely exceeded. It is a significant fact, and one which should not be lost sight of in estimating the value of railway enterprise in India, that, concurrently with a scale of rates regarded in some quarters as ruinous and disastrous, the East Indian Railway is now paying 8 per cent. upon its capital—largely increased as it was by the bonus paid to the shareholders on the state exercising its right of purchase—of £38,000,000.

This paragraph, Mr. Chairman, tempts me to recur to my opening remark, and ask our wheat-growers whether it may not be true not only of manufactures but of their special agricultural industry that the power of production has outrun the capacity of the people to consume. To settle this question properly in their own minds they must not only consider our own undeveloped capacity and that of the Saskatchewan Valley and other wheat-fields of the new Northwest, but that of India, and far more potential for evil to us than India, the great wheat-growing prairies of Southern Russia. The rapidly declining price of wheat and the reduced export demand for it indicates the possibility of what political economists call a glut in the market, but which, in nine cases out of ten, philosophic inquiry proves to be evidence of a want of ability on the part of the people to purchase the amount of commodities they usually consume. The market may be overstocked with a particular article, but can not be glutted with everything that man wants

while great masses of people suffer from the lack of ability to supply their most imperative wants. The future of the wheat market may in my judgment be discussed as an exceptional article with which the world's markets may be overstocked while the ruling rates of wages prevail.

The abandonment of the protective system even to the destruction of particular manufacturing industries by which we have already excluded the manufacture of quinine, tin plates, wire rods, cotton-ties, and hoop-iron cut to lengths, which latter articles consume hundreds of thousands of tons of raw iron annually, has wrought two evil effects upon the American farmers' interests.

American laborers and their families feed on American grain and provisions, but the Germans, who are henceforth to manufacture our quinine, and the laborers of whatever continental country who are to produce our supply of cotton-ties, hoop-iron cut to lengths, wire rods, and tin plates, together with the hundreds of thousands of tons of iron they will consume annually will be provided with cheaper food from other lands.

This is one effect of even partial free trade upon the interests of farmers. The other is that the men we have banished from the mine, furnace, and factory will find their way to fresh farms to increase the production of wheat of which the supply is already superabundant. The primary want of the American farmer is a quick and remunerative home market. When our mills, forges, furnaces, and factories were busy and our operatives were well paid we consumed nine-tenths of all the cereals we could grow, but with idleness prevailing in industrial centers, with the reduction of wages and the power to consume, and with the expulsion of great branches of industry from the country, we can not look to an increase in the home demand or the maintenance of past prices for wheat.

I have said that our wheat-growers are in more danger from Russia than from India, and this is true. Southern Russia is one immense body of prairie land, as fertile as and in all respects resembling the rich wheat fields of Illinois. The aggregate of Russia's production of wheat for export has hitherto been limited by the want of agricultural machinery, railroads leading to available seaports, and a system of elevators. When these improvements shall be introduced in connection with the little better than Indian wages that are paid to Russian peasants, the foreign market for grain produced on our high-priced land, and at

from one to two thousand miles from ports of shipment, will not pay the cost of production and transportation.

But it will be asked, is there danger of the establishment of such means of competition? In reply to this question I beg leave to tell gentlemen that the Russian Government has been and is again in negotiation with American parties to establish in the heart of this great wheat-growing country factories for the production of agricultural implements, to undertake the construction of railroads over the level surface of this prairie land, and of systems of elevators at convenient points along the railroads and in the shipping ports to which they will lead. I am no prophet of evil, no Cassandra, and have not risen to say to our farmers that this overwhelming competition is their inevitable and immediate fate; my mission is now, as it has been for all the years of my mature life, to avert, if wise counsels can do it, such disaster to any portion of the American people. Observation and the privilege of many years of intimate intercourse with Henry C. Carey have taught me that identity of interests among the people of a great country abundantly supplied with multifarious native material is created and maintained by the diversification of employments; that when manufactures prosper the farmer finds a ready market for his productions, from the smallest that reward the care of his wife or children to the great crops, such as corn, wheat, cotton, and tobacco; and that his prosperity reacts upon his countrymen who are engaged in producing wares and fabrics for his use. The highest degree of general prosperity is only attained by the promotion by each class of the prosperity of all other classes.

If he will accept and apply broad truths like these the American farmer is in no danger of a glut in the market for the growth of his fields; he, too, can diversify his productions, and in doing so can secure the market afforded by more than 55,000,000 of energetic people, among whom pernicious anæmia and kindred diseases are unknown—the market of 55,000,000 of people who, unlike the ryot of India who raises wheat but lives on rice and knows not the taste of animal food, eat meat daily, make daily use of tea and coffee, and are free consumers of sugar. Yes; and herein the wheat-grower may find a cure for his apprehension. For sugar and sirup we now pay foreigners more than \$100,000,000 a year, every dollar of which will in a few years, if our farmers be but true to themselves, go into their pockets, together with those of the pro-

prietors of corn and sorghum mills and sugar refineries, around which industrial villages will cluster in every part of our farming land on which Indian corn will ripen. In making this assertion I am not drawing upon imagination. That clear, crystallized sugar can be profitably produced in merchantable quantities from corn is demonstrated beyond a doubt; and that corn sugar is a much less profitable growth and manufacture than is sugar from sorghum is also a fact demonstrated and established beyond all peradventure.

Our farmers, therefore, need not fear the competition of low wages in the wheat fields of India and Russia. Wheat-culture exhausts the soil. The wheat we export beyond the sea carries with it the vital principles of the farm on which it was raised, which do not return to enrich the producers' acres as they do when consumed in industrial villages or large cities near to where it was grown. With sugar-yielding plants it is otherwise; they are green plants, and give to the soil the nutriment they absorb from the atmosphere. Wherever corn will ripen sorghum can be produced in perfection, and the value of the seed alone of this plant is found to be equal to the cost of growing and housing the entire crop. Not only does this seed furnish nutriment to swine and horned cattle, but historians and travelers give us abundant assurance that in the past more people have lived on sorghum seed than have been sustained by wheat. Myriads of the people of the interior of Africa and Asia, from which dark regions we are but now receiving supplies of richer varieties of the sorghum plant than we have yet grown, have for centuries found in its seed food-supply equal to that the Caucasian races have found in wheat.

It is, however, not from the seed, but the stalk of the plant that sirup and sugar are extracted, and this is not taken until fodder, as efficient and adequate in supply as is yielded by corn, has been stripped from it; and after having yielded its luscious juice, the stalk leaves a residuum or bagasse rich in value as material from which to manufacture paper or, when properly dried, as fuel for culinary or other purposes. In sober truth it may be said that there is no industry practiced by our farmers on a large scale east of that greater Sicily, our marvelously endowed California, which gives the farmer such returns as may be earned by him who will devote his acres, under his own intelligent supervision, to the production of sorghum for a neighboring sugar-mill; but if the farmer

wishes to maintain the value of his acres, his implements, and his labor he must not run mad in pursuit of the cheap and nasty or hope to ensure happy days to his posterity by inflicting the effects of the dismal science upon the manufacturing laborers of his country. Let him above all things require his Representative to stand by the duties which protect those of his countrymen who are already engaged in the production of sugar and sirup, whether from cane, corn, or sorghum.

Thus may the wheat-grower avert the dangers which threaten his interests. But what is to be done to protect our artisans and laborers from degradation such as the American traveler finds in foreign lands—degradation which is threatening the peace of every transatlantic country and the edicts of whose victims banded in secret societies, whether of nihilists, socialists, communists, land-leaguers, or what not, are the premonitory mutterings of a convulsion which in its violence will probably exceed that of ‘93,” and which good men may hope will put the future of humanity on a foundation of justice such as no government or national life now illustrates? How, I ask again, shall we protect and defend the homes, the wives, and the children of our laborers from such degradation as the same class suffer in other lands? How secure such rewards to labor as will sustain our public schools and provide reasonable education for all our children; how protect American women from being employed as I have seen women in Austria, Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands, France, England, and Scotland, as beasts of burden in the field and laborers at merely nominal wages in attendance upon men who do skilled work in the construction of great buildings, in forges, founderies, rolling-mills, glass-works, and coal, iron, or other mines? If our Republic is to live, the wives of our men and the mothers of our children must be protected at whatever cost of economic abstractions against such degradation as this. [Applause.] One step in this direction should be taken at once. We should forthwith prohibit the importation of cheap labor as we do that of cheap commodities, and send back to the country from which they have been shipped men or women who have signed contracts in foreign lands or on shipboard to work at lower than prevailing American wages. [Renewed applause.] This measure, though an important one, is but a palliative in a matter in which radical and enduring relief is demanded.

Having pondered the question during the watches of many a night

and sought counsel from the best thinkers to whose voices or volumes I have had access, I can point to but two means by which our laboring classes can be saved from justifiable discontent by having the opportunity to work at living wages in every month of the year. They are, first to secure to productive labor a larger proportion of the joint production of labor and capital; and second, to make such statutory provision for the Territories and the District of Columbia and to appeal to the Legislatures of the several States also to provide by law that eight hours or less shall be the longest period in any one day that man or machinery may move in productive employment. [Great applause.]

How these vital changes are to be accomplished I do not see. In other lands the effort will be made through blood and carnage. Here, where the laborer's vote is of as much weight as that of the millionaire, the revolution, for such it will be, will doubtless come peaceably, but its coming is inevitable, and this fact should be forever in the contemplation of the legislator. I see but one way through which we can reach this great result; it is, if need be, to realize the wish of Jefferson, not by putting a sea of fire between us and other manufacturing countries, but by enacting a tariff that will secure our home market to our producers so entirely that manufacturers may afford to run their machinery eight hours and pay those who attend it a day's work for this amount of labor.

It is for our country and our countrymen and not for mankind we legislate. Our country is unlike any other. It is in its breadth and the infinite variety of its resources sufficient unto itself, and could live if its people imported nothing but what would be exchanged for that which would be surplus within our limits. Our Government is also unlike any other. It is not a monarchy; it is not a despotism; it is not an oligarchy; but is a free democratic Republic, of which every human being born within its limits is a citizen, entitled to the rights of a free man, and with the duty laid upon him of assisting in the maintenance of the perpetuity of a government which can live only so long as virtue, intelligence, and independence characterize its citizens. May that Government be immortal. But, friends and countrymen, this it can not be if we are to enter it in the unholy race Britain is making with barbarous nations for the "cheap and nasty" under the terrible teachings of the "dismal science." [Great and continued applause.]

RETURN TO → CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
202 Main Library

LOAN PERIOD 1

HOME USE

4

5

6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

Renewals and Recharges may be made 4 days prior to the due date.

Books may be Renewed by calling 642-3405

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

[illegible]

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
BERKELEY, CA 94720

FORM NO. DD6

®

APR 12 1972

REC. CIR.

LIBRARY of

MAY 2 5 20

LD 21A-45m-9.67
(H5067s10)476B

LIBRARY USE
45m-9:67

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

U C BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C051421306

